



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,341	09/25/2003	Stephen A. Baum	P26,015 US1	7066
23307	7590	01/24/2008	EXAMINER	
SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER, LLP			GROSS, CHRISTOPHER M	
1101 MARKET STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
26TH FLOOR			1639	
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107-2950				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/24/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/671,341	BAUM, STEPHEN A.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christopher M. Gross	1639

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 46,47,49-51,54 and 56-85 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 57,59 and 63-85 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 46,47,49-51,54,56,58,60-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

Responsive to communications entered 10/29/2007. Claims 46-47,49-51,54,56,57-85 are pending. Claims 57,59,63-85 are withdrawn. Claims 46,47,49-51,54,56,58,60-62 are examined herein.

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/29/2007 has been entered.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

### *Priority*

Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application); the disclosure of the invention in the prior application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Prods., Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994) [taken from MPEP 201.01]

The instant application, filed 9/25/2003 claims priority as a DIV of application 09/082,038 filed 05/20/1998 (now PAT 6,872,535). It is noted, however that sufficient

support for "solid phase supports in the columns are substantially aligned" as set forth in amended claim 46 is not disclosed in the earlier application (09/082038). See also new matter considerations below.

Therefore 9/25/2003 is the date for the purposes of prior art concerning claims 46,47,49-51,54,56,58,60-62.

***Withdrawn Rejection(s)***

The rejection of claims 46,47,49-51,54,56,58,60-62 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is hereby withdrawn in view of applicants' deletion of the term superimposed in claim 26.

***Maintained Claim Rejection(s) - 35 USC § 102***

Claims 46,47,49-51,54,56,58,60-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Stein et al.**

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant argues, see p 11 (10/29/2007) that all the claims are entitled to priority of 5/20/1998 because claim 46, as amended, inserting the limitation "solid phase supports in the columns are substantially aligned" finds support earlier application 09/082,038 filed 05/20/1998. It is noted, however that this limitation represents a genus not disclosed in the earlier application and represents new matter (see below), thus because priority is denied (see above) and Stein et al is art under 35 USC 102(b) and the rejection is hereby maintained.

***New Claim Rejection(s) – 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the **first** paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 46,47,49-51,54,56,58,60-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

*This rejection is necessitated by Applicant's amendment to the claims.*

Claim 46 has been amended to insert the limitation "solid phase supports in the columns are substantially aligned."

It is noted support for the *genus* of solid phase supports in columns being substantially aligned is not found in the specification as filed. It is noted that support for the *species* of tube-type supports being substantially aligned is found in paragraph 0081 and figure 21 of the published application.

It is noted, however the specification as originally filed provided no implicit or explicit support for generic solid-phase supports being substantially aligned. Similarly, the priority document (US Patent 6872535) does not provide any implicit or explicit support for generic solid phase supports being substantially aligned.

The examiner submits, the "substantial alignment" in paragraph 0081 of the published application concerns alignment in the X and Y dimensions of the inner walls of element 2120, illustrated in figure 21, so that rods of the transfer device line up

properly. Notably, it appears that embodiments employing small beaded solid supports rely on alignment of bead enclosure for transfer, rather than alignment of the beads themselves, since they too small to be removed with a rod.

Applicants are reminded that it is their burden to show where the specification supports any amendments to the disclosure. See MPEP 714.02, paragraph 5, last sentence and also MPEP 2163.06 I.

MPEP 2163.06 notes "If new matter is added to the claims, the examiner should reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph - written description requirement.

*In re Rasmussen*, 650 F.2d 1212, 211 USPQ 323 (CCPA 1981)." MPEP 2163.02 teaches that "Whenever the issue arises, the fundamental factual inquiry is whether a claim defines an invention that is clearly conveyed to those skilled in the art at the time the application was filed...If a claim is amended to include subject matter, limitations, or terminology not present in the application as filed, involving a departure from, addition to, or deletion from the disclosure of the application as filed, the examiner should conclude that the claimed subject matter is not described in that application. MPEP 2163.06 further notes "When an amendment is filed in reply to an objection or rejection based on 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, a study of the entire application is often necessary to determine whether or not "new matter" is involved. *Applicant should therefore specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure.*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher M. Gross whose telephone number is (571)272-4446. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, J. Douglas Schultz can be reached on 571 272-0763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christopher M Gross  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1639

cg



MARK L. SHIBUYA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER